

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

[One dollar per annum.]

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."—Paul.

[Payable in advance]

VOL. VI.]

PORTLAND, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1826.

[No. 12.]

[For the Christian Intelligencer.]

LETTER NO. IV.

To a Young Universalist Preacher.

My dear friend—In my last letter, I anticipated some objections to the course of preaching, which, in a very brief, and general manner, was indicated in that communication. In this, I am to meet those objections. The principal inducement to the consideration of this subject, is, that, we hear the assertion frequently made, that "the gospel is wholly the proclamation of grace, while all threatenings belong to the legal economy." While I am aware, that this statement may come from honest hearts, I am convinced of its falsity; and believe it leads to dangerous consequences, and is directly opposed to the scheme of evangelical preaching, described in the New Testament. With such views of the case, you will not wonder if I devote this letter, and even others, if necessary, which may follow, to the illustration of my own ideas on a topic of so great importance.

It was the determination of St. Paul, "to know, to preach nothing but Jesus Christ." To preach Jesus Christ is precisely the same as preaching the gospel. The terms are synonymous. Now, what did this preaching embrace? Into what departments was it divided? Or did it consist only in the announcement of pardon and peace? The proper answer to these questions must be drawn from particular declarations of the topics, or points, on which the apostles dwelt in their preaching. To the Colossians, Paul speaks of "Christ in them, the hope of glory"; and then adds, "whom we preach, WARNING every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." If teaching is a branch of the christian ministry, warning is no less so, and the latter is as much a mean of perfecting the christian character as the former. Warning is nearly allied to threatening, and it always involves the idea of danger. It supposes the existence of an evil, which the warning is intended to cause the hearer to avoid. If these statements are well-founded, as I am convinced they are, it follows, that the preaching of the gospel contains something more, than the mere declaration of grace, or the announcement of mercy through Jesus Christ. It embraces warning against all sinfulness and its effects; it involves all the threatenings which God has denounced against sinners; "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and

unrighteousness of men." Hence, if a preacher holds forth a free salvation by Jesus Christ, according to the "eternal purpose" of the father, he preaches the gospel. If he insists on the necessity of repentance, as a mean to effect this salvation, he preaches the gospel; his discourse has the sanction of those early preachers, who "testified repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ." If he denounces the just judgments of God on such as neglect and despise the riches of divine goodness, he still preaches the gospel; and if he advances the idea, that the person, who has known and enjoyed the privileges and blessings of the gospel, and who should "turn from the holy commandment," would be liable to a more dreadful punishment than was inflicted on him, "who despised Moses' law"; the preacher would have no reason to fear, that he exceeded his commission; he would have the countenance and example of the apostle who wrote to the Hebrews, whose writings are much occupied with motives to watchfulness, with dissuaves from sin, and with declarations of the righteous retribution, that will assuredly overtake the careless, bold transgressor. "Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering to his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. We ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time, we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward, how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation"? All this, and much more to the same purpose, is the doctrine of an eminent preacher of the gospel.

What may be called practical preaching, the object of which is to persuade the hearers to the practice of moral duties, is not very highly esteemed by many, for reasons similar to those which are urged against the denunciation of punishment for sin; practical discourses are not considered evangelical. In some instances, the man, who should dwell on the most important duties enjoined in the New Testament, would subject himself to many absurd charges. It would be no new thing, if he was ranked with the rigidly orthodox, and charged with a desire to court their favor. The least that he could expect from many, would be, to hear his discourse; denominated dry and uninteresting; and probably they would be said to savour much of a pharisaical spirit. These notions are founded in error; they are the result of too limited views of the gospel; and,

as I believe, arise, in a considerable degree, from a corrupt taste. But having brought this letter to a sufficient length, I shall reserve my further observations on this subject for a subsequent epistle. Yours sincerely, ———.

CONVOCATION & CONVENTION—AGAIN.

SIR—Perceiving in your last number, an article taken from the Gospel Advocate, intended as a reply to some remarks of our's, lately published in your paper, under the head of "Convocation and Convention," we have thought proper, with your permission, briefly to rejoin.—Whether the writer of that article wishes to engage with us in a controversy, for the sake of it, or whether he has an eye steadily fixed on the prosperity and good order of the general cause, we cannot tell: but this we know, whatever may be his object, we are far, as far as we can be, from wishing to enter the ranks as a public disputant, merely for the sake of a "war of words." The general interest and welfare of the common cause we have espoused, is the only inducement we have,—and surely that is enough to induce any one, to take the ground, and fearlessly contend for, or against, any such innovations, as may appear to us useful, or prejudicial, to the accomplishment of the object we have in view. And if this be the motive which influences him; if he has the same object in view which we have; we dare to predict, without pretending to be possessed of supernatural powers, that the result of our differences in opinion will not be essentially injurious.

Those of your readers, who have carefully perused our former communication, will perceive at once, that we did not either justify or condemn the measures, which were recommended by the Convocation, and accepted by the Convention, in question: or the conduct of those who brought them forward. We could not—for we did not know precisely what they were, or by what means, or in what manner, they were passed: and this we frankly acknowledged. We only said, and we say so now, that "the time has arrived, when *something* should be done, and done effectually, relative to the better regulation and government of our Conventions, Associations and Societies." And does not the writer of the article we are noticing acknowledge this? He certainly does,—for he tells us unreservedly, that "our present discipline is quite imperfect." And he tells us more—yet it is what we all knew—that "there is an apparent want of order among us." Yet he will not allow that these evils arise from "any deficiency in the plan of government, which has heretofore been adopted, and is now in use by our order;" but very deliberately tells us, that "they are *probably* owing to the present plan not having been carried into execution." Be it so. If he,

perchance, should be correct in his opinion; if "the path be good, and require at present neither improvement nor innovation; still, what we have urged is correct; for the time has arrived when *something* should be done,—certainly, if nothing more, the present plan should be "unanimously adopted and enforced." And if this will bring order out of the present confusion, and root out and destroy the evils among us, depend upon it, we shall not be heard to say—"throw it by, and institute another."

But we are free to acknowledge, that we are very much inclined to believe, notwithstanding what has been said, that there is not strength and virtue enough, in the present plan of government, to establish and reform the order. Yet we do not wish to propose any system to be adopted—that we are willing to submit to abler hands. With regard however, to the question of forming a Convention of *Ministers exclusively*, what seems to be the principal cause of complaint, we are not prepared to give a decided, unqualified negative. We do not tremble at the consequences that might result, even if this were the case. We do not care so much, as many seem to, whether that body be composed of ministers or laymen, provided always, they are honest, intelligent men. There are questions, as every one must admit, sometimes brought up for consideration, which should not be submitted to thoughtless, indifferent men. We do not believe it would be more dangerous to invest the power in the hands of the ministering brethren, than it is in the hands of those who now possess it. We are not so ready and willing to distrust and decry the purity and honesty of the *clergy*, as many are:—nevertheless, we do not wish to see them, more than others, invested with improper authority.

If it be true, as we are told it is, that, "as we are now situated, there is a *remedy provided* for every disease," it is to be deeply and sincerely regretted, that we have no Physician, who can administer the prescription with success. If "our churches and societies are under the immediate control of our Association;" if "each member of either society is subject to the watch-care and discipline of the brethren who best know his virtues and his faults;" if "the ministering brethren are amenable to the Association;" it is a criminal neglect of duty in those to whom the authority rightfully belongs, that they do not assume it, and exercise their prerogative. Certain it is, that the present state of things requires it. We might as well have no plan of government at all, as to have one, which is either so little known and understood, or so indefinite in its requirements, as to have no practical effect on its subjects. But we shall believe, at present, that there is a greater defect in the plan of government itself, than in the

administration of it. We cannot believe—and we would not if we could—that the present derangement and disorder, which prevail among us, are to be attributed to a want of virtue and energy in those, whose duty it is, to see that the requirements of our government are properly regarded. Nor are we so apprehensive, as many of our brethren appear to be, that we shall injure the cause we wish to promote, by attempting to improve the present plan of government, and recommending new rules for future observance. We do not discover any alarming evils, which can possibly arise from going on in the work of reformation: and if, perchance, we find it necessary, now and then, to step aside from the course heretofore pursued, we do not indulge many fears that we shall thereby “imitate the antichristian practices of partial, proud, and pompous priests.” Nor do we think,—we mention this, for the sake of conferring a favor on the public by informing them,—that we must necessarily follow the examples of those that have corrupted Christianity, in our endeavor to remove the corruptions from it. But is there no danger, does our friend think, that, in rashly attempting to root out the tares, the wheat may not be rooted up also? We have more fears on this ground, than on any other; not that we would encourage the laborer to “stand idle all the day,” lest he should accidentally root up some of the good with the bad; but we would encourage him, by all means, to be extremely careful how he proceeds in accomplishing his task. If he has seen those that labored in the field before him, proceed, in some respects, in an injudicious manner, and rather injure than promote the interest of the husbandman, let him carefully avoid their errors; but let him not, under the pretence of being disgusted with the deformity of their errors, in a moment of thoughtlessness and irritation, rashly refuse to follow their practices wherein they were correct. We care not whether we find that which is good among our enemies or our friends,—whenever we find it, we will gladly receive it, and endeavor to profit by it. We do not imagine that we have yet reached the acme of purity and perfection; and that we cannot learn useful lessons from those that we may consider, as it respects some speculative doctrinal points, in an error. It does not follow, because they cannot read the sacred page with our eyes, and understand what it contains as we do, that they are therefore far from being right in all that they do. Let us be discriminating, with regard to their conduct; and magnanimous enough, at the same time, to examine it impartially: and while we condemn and reject that which is evil, let us be men enough to approve and receive that which is good.

In closing our communication, we would seriously ask our friend, whether the good order that prevails among some of those sects, whose errors in doctrine we sincerely condemn and deplore, is not to be attributed to the system of government which they have adopted? Call it republican, or aristocratical, or monarchical, or whatever you please—we care not for names—if it is productive of order and tends to the prosperity of the general cause, it is therefore proper and safe.—And we would recommend it to him, and to all, who feel an interest in promoting the Redeemer’s cause, not to attach too much importance to names, but to be actuated and influenced by the dictates of conscience, and the principles of christianity.

C. G.

[READERS; the following extracts are from the same paper, (the *Providence Telescope and Miscellany*;) which arraigned us, a short time since, as an accomplice to infidelity, for having published the *very articles*, which are now *defended*, at full length, in that paper, of the 7th inst. occupying not less than *five columns*. And, instead of offering an objection, or even an *intimation*, against the sentiments of the writer, the Editor of the *Telescope* informs his readers, that he has admitted the arguments of “T.” against “A Believer,” because he believes the controversy will be interesting and useful!!

But, however great may appear the inconsistency, in his conduct, we shall act upon the precept,—“Render unto all their dues”; for he does not pretend to consider his paper, “on a level with the columns of the *Christian Intelligencer*.” As a spontaneous effusion of *good humor*, we would just suggest for the consolation of our brother EDITOR, that he has no reason for being discouraged. A part of his columns have been *coming up*, rapidly, of late. His 8th No. had but *two* columns from our paper; but his 9th, only a week later, had about *ten* columns out of *twenty-four*, from the *Intelligencer*, and the pen of Theophilanthropist. Hence, as he has *got up almost half-way* to “A LEVEL” with us, in two weeks, we think he had better persevere. Had it not been for his editorial pieces, his last No. would have been worthy of the enlightened town, from which it emanated.]—ED.

To “A Believer in Divine Revelation,” who appeared in the *Telescope* of Sept. 2.

Sir—You have taken the liberty to arraign before the readers of the *Telescope*, the Editor of the *Christian Intelligencer*, published in Portland, Me. on account of a communication published in his paper, written by me. You, by the authority which you supposed yourself vested with, from a belief “in the doctrine of impartial grace and salvation,” have voluntarily come forward to censure an individual, for giving publicity to my essay without first *stripping* it “of its garb,” and *manfully exposing* “its deformity.” But, so far as your imputation may seem to attach criminality to the liberality of that individual, it need only be said to the candid readers of the *Telescope*, in order to acquit him of it, that when you wrote your address to him, I had only published *one number* of my essay. However much disposed and deter-

mined he might have been to refute and to point out its "incorrectness," every candid and indulgent person cannot but perceive, that he could not have done so with any degree of propriety, or civility, until I had finished my arguments and proofs, and much less when I had only published the *first number* of it. But, you saw fit to upbraid him for not doing so, and without waiting to see whether he would or not, in due season. When you wrote to censure him, and to accuse me of a "*deadly intention*" against revealed religion, you had seen but one essay. Now let the reader judge of your candor and liberality. I have made this digression, in order that the readers of the Telescope may discard all such prepossessions against me and my subject, as may have been created in their minds by the unjustifiable, and certainly premature acrimony which you dealt out to the editor of the *Intelligencer* on account of my communication, which I now undertake to defend.—Now, sir, I will proceed to the merits of your address, and what appears to be the extent of honesty in your designs.

Why did you not "*strip it of its garb and manfully expose its deformity,*" when you *republished* it, if you thought that to have been the indispensable duty of those who did publish it? The most that you did do, was to make a homely digest of some parts of it, and a miserable caricature of other parts of it. Instead of *stripping* it of any garb, you garbled it most horribly, by publishing half sentences of it in one place, and detached parts of it in another. Is this fair play, or gentlemanly criticism? Does it look like an impartial inquiry for truth? If so, to you, depend upon it, sir, it is so because your "*intense moral interest*" borders on bigotry.

You say my communication "*is a blow aimed with deadly intention at the very root of the whole system of revealed religion,*" and to justify your remark, you quote from it certain conclusions, (one of which is, that the Old Testament is *imperfect and defective,*) but quote none of the *reasons and facts* which are advanced there in support of them. It is in this way only, sir, that you have, or can make my communication appear frightful to the timid bigot, or deformed in the eyes of the credulous.

Sir, be it known to you, that I have in store, an abundance of *testimony*, not mere arguments alone, to corroborate all I have said respecting the *imperfection and defectiveness* of the Old Testament, and such testimony as you will not have the audacity to contradict. Let me direct your attention to the inspired writers of the New Testament, who, in comparing the Old with the New, contemptuously as it were, call the institutions and

doctrines of the former "*beggarly elements*"—"the law of a carnal commandment,"—forming "a yoke which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear." These are the assertions of inspired writers, which also represent Christ's doctrines as "*a greater and more perfect tabernacle,*" which clearly implies that the former was *lesser and less perfect*; and if less perfect, it certainly was *imperfect* in a degree. Now I said nothing so harsh, as the above sayings, in my communication which seems to have clashed so outrageously with the intensity of your "*moral interest in the prosperity and spread of revealed religion.*" Why then did you not first accuse Paul and others of aiming a blow "*with deadly intention at the very root of revealed religion?*" Was it because of your "*unpardonable ignorance of what the New Testament contains?*" If so, let me tell you, it contains yet more.

But again, you say of me, "*His pretended approbation and preference to the morality of the New Testament, betrays either an unpardonable ignorance of what the New Testament contains; or what is worse, [worse than what is unpardonable, did you mean to say?] an intention to deceive the unwary:* For every attentive reader of the New Testament has discovered, that *both Christ and his Apostles* UNIFORMLY recommend the *same morality* which is taught in the Pentateuch, and by the prophets."

Now what do you mean by your first sentence above? Would you impute to me "*unpardonable ignorance of what the New Testament contains,*" because I *prefer* it to the Old Testament? If you would, cannot you discover upon reflection, that you either betray your own ignorance of the New Testament's containing the following passage respecting Christ and his doctrines, viz:—"Now hath he obtained a *more excellent* ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a *better covenant*, which was established upon *better promises*. For if that *first* had been *faultless*, then should no place have been sought for the *second*."—I say, you either betray your own ignorance of this passage's being in the New Testament, most clearly and explicitly declaiming the *imperfection* of the Old and the *preferableness* of the New Testament, or you betray what you say is worse than *unpardonable ignorance*, an *intention to deceive the unwary*, by keeping up the idea that the New Testament is not in principle and reality preferable to the Old. Choose which you prefer; one, or both must attach to you.

Again, you ask, "*What did Theophilanthropist mean by the defect and imperfection of the Old Testament?* He certainly could not mean that it was worthy of belief." By this question and answer,

you would evidently have your readers believe, that I contend the Bible is unworthy of belief.—To justify such a conclusion respecting my meaning, you say, that I deny it is worthy of belief, by saying, that I “cannot possibly avoid seriously doubting of its being what it has long been supposed to be, of divine inspiration, i. e. derived by a direct communication of God with man.” What a gross misrepresentation have you given of my conclusions! Every candid reader will here detect you in a foul attempt to deceive the unwary, by imposing upon them such an unnatural inference. If I say that a passage was not dictated by God, do I thereby say that it is false and unworthy of belief? What a horrid perversion of common reason and common sense it is, to suppose it. Cannot I deny a thing to have been communicated by God to man, without denying it to be worthy of belief? Suppose I should say, what you wrote was not communicated to you by God, should I thereby say that it is not worthy of belief? You would be unwilling to have such testimony considered as conclusive against you. You cannot but know your inference to be a false one, artfully dressed in order to prejudice the reader against what I had written, and by deceptively leading him to believe, that I had said the Bible is unworthy of belief. Now so far from holding forth in my communication the idea, that the Old Testament, or that any thing is unworthy of belief, because not derived by a direct communication of God with man, I said, in so many words, “that which is perfectly reasonable, and easily to be understood, or self-evident facts, need not be communicated under the sanction or in the name of Deity, for Deity has so constituted the human mind, that it must unavoidably assent to whatever appears rational, or so far as a thing or proposition appears plausible.”

THEOPHILANTHROPIST.

Portland, (Me.) Sept. 14, 1826.

CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER.

PORTLAND.....SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1826.

The Editor's Address to his Readers.

FRIENDS AND BRETHREN; In consequence of the attempt to impress on the public mind, the allegation, that the Editor of this paper has been accessory to the dissemination of *libertine* sentiments, it becomes necessary for me to address you, over my own name, that you may know I hold myself morally responsible for my conduct, not only, as the conductor of a religious journal, but, as a minister of Christ and a member of the General Convention of Universalists. As men of principle and integrity, you will at once see the importance of this communication. I owe it to myself, to my family, and the cause which I have espoused, to make my defence, and clear myself of all the charges, which have been published against me, or, suffer

the demerit of my actions, at the tribunal of equitable and enlightened opinion. That I may have *erred*, is at once admitted; but that such *errors* have proceeded from any dereliction of faith in Christ, or any rancorous spirit, is most boldly and solemnly denied. Hence, if it is the opinion of a majority of our Convention, that I have wilfully done wrong, and still persist in it, that Body is unworthy of all confidence, and ought to be anathematized by all honest christians, if they do not call me to an account, and excommunicate me from their fellowship, as soon as possible. So fully convinced am I, of the justice of my cause and the purity of my motives, that I challenge an examination, by the suggestion of any minister of the order, whose conscience may dictate such a measure.

1. It has been alleged, that I have been accessory to the dissemination of those principles, which “aim a deadly blow at the whole system of revealed religion.” Now to this charge, I positively and seriously plead,—*Not guilty*. The articles to which the above complaint alludes or on which it is founded, are contained in the 6th, 7th and 8th Nos. of the *Intelligencer*, over the signature, “Theophilanthropist.” Having carefully and prayerfully examined those communications, I am decidedly of opinion, that, however unsuccessful the author may have been in the attempt, *his whole aim was*, to render the system of revealed religion intelligible and useful; by showing that its leading and more excellent parts are consistent with the principles of sound philosophy and the dictates of common sense; and that, for an enlightened age, no miracles would be necessary to render those principles obvious and acceptable.

But it may be candidly *objected* by some, that, “such articles ought not to appear, in a Universalist publication, lest it should induce our opposers to repeat, what they have ever maintained, viz. that Universalism is nearly allied to Deism.”

Answer. Has the Editor of any opposing print, either calvinistic or armenian, been so uncandid and unjust, as to sound such an alarm? As ready as most of them are to avail themselves of every opportunity, to render Universalism obnoxious, on account of believing it to be a dangerous and soul-destroying system, have they so much as intimated to their readers, that another evidence had appeared, of the dissemination of Deism, under the cloak of our doctrine? No, my friends; it is the pretended benevolence of a professed Universalist, that has become my accuser. Yea; although the many Editors of opposing sentiments, with whom I exchange, might have made a bold display before their readers, by quoting their allegation from a paper of our own Order, and by that means have made it still more plausible; yet, as appears from the circumstances, they are men of too much principle and moral dignity, to descend to such contemptible misrepresentations. For this example of superior justice and honor, on the part of our sentimental opposers, I shall lower the tone of proscription against them, as occasions may

permit; and take this opportunity to inform all who may please to write for my paper, that their communications will be subject, (if need there be) to *erasures* and *alterations*, in conformity to this standard.

But it is stated by a friend, whose opinion I habitually venerate, that "Theophilanthropist reasons as all Deistical writers have, who attempted to overthrow the Christian religion."

Answer. I know but very little of the reasoning of Deists. When about fifteen years old, I read, in part, a small book, called "The Age of Reason, by Thomas Paine;" but his speculations were philosophically above the comprehension of an unlettered boy; and I have never, to my recollection, seen one of the books, from that day to the present. About ten years after that, a very intelligent neighbor called on me, to borrow Br. Ballou's "Treatise on the Atonement;" and on returning it, presented me with a work, by one John Palmer; but the title has escaped my recollection. I took the volume, and, as we were conversing sociably, dipt into its pages at random, for the space of an hour. But finding that Palmer was ridiculing the dogmas of orthodoxy, such as "the trinity," "vicarious sufferings," "endless misery," and also the morality of the Gospel, I told my good friend, that the book would be of no service to me, as those doctrinal points were ably refuted, in the Treatise, by Br. Ballou; and the other part I considered sophistical. And I have not seen a work of the kind, since; nor am I able to judge of the merits of Palmer's production, further, than that I concluded, he was a cunning, confident, censorious reasoner, in opposition to some truths as well as many errors.

In justice to my Universalist brethren in the ministry, I must remark, that having looked over the titles of books in many of their libraries, I do not recollect to have seen an avowed Deistical author among them. I must therefore depend on those brethren, who have made Deism their study, till they have become such adepts in the science as to be able to discover it, however cautiously expressed, for a further explanation of the system. But I soberly declare, that, I cannot discover any important resemblance, between "Theophilanthropist," and the writers above mentioned, so far as I can recollect their process of reasoning.

If I am not mistaken, Paine and Palmer undertook to ridicule the Scriptures, on the ground, that the writers of them made pretensions to a kind of inspiration, wholly incompatible with the principles of philosophy and the eternal laws of nature. Whereas, in diametric opposition to this, our author endeavors to maintain, that the word, "inspiration," has, like many other terms, assumed a different meaning from what it originally conveyed; and when restored to its true and primitive signification, is perfectly consistent with the principles of reason, and the universal law of God in nature; and that, by this mode of interpretation, the writers of the Bible are entitled to full credit, having written, according to their best understanding of

the character of Deity. But that Moses did not so well understand, and could not so fully make known the character of God, as did Jesus Christ.—And further. Palmer contended that, the morality of Jesus was ridiculous and absurd, and worse than that of Moses; whereas, "Theophilanthropist" maintains, that, the morality of Jesus was perfect, and vastly preferable to the morality of Moses. And yet we are told, that these clashing modes of reasoning are precisely alike!

Readers; believing you will candidly examine these remarks, I must dismiss the subject, for the present.

R. STREETER.

A BRIEF DISSERTATION,

On the Inspiration and Revelation of the Holy Scriptures.

CONTINUED.

In pursuing this important subject we shall offer some thoughts on the Scriptures, as a REVELATION from God.

2. Of REVELATION. The word APOKALYPTO, which is translated, *to reveal*, is, from APO, *from*, and KALYPTO, *to hide, conceal*. The meaning, therefore, is, *to remove a veil or covering*, so as to expose to view what was before hidden. To make a thing manifest, which was concealed; or to make known, what was unknown. This word in the LXX generally answers to a Hebrew word, signifying, *to remove or turn back a garment or covering*; which corroborates the above definition. Thus far the subject is involved in no difficulty. A revelation, according to the proper or literal sense of the term, may be made by man, or by Deity. And, indeed, we esteem it infinitely derogatory to the character of God, to deny his having power or disposition, to reveal, manifest, or make known, the most important truths, to his intelligent creation. Such truths, it must be admitted, have been made known by some being; and, who, let us be told, is so worthy of being their author and revealer, as the Almighty Spirit, without whom, no creature could exist?

If we examine the scriptures, we shall find this definition and view of revelation, abundantly confirmed.

1. We have an account of human revelations. "A tale-bearer revealeth secrets: but he that is of a prudent spirit, concealeth the matter."—Prov. xi. 13. In Matt. x. 26, we are told, "there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and hid that shall not be made known;" and in Luke ii. 35, "the thoughts of many hearts shall be revealed." That this kind of revelation does not imply any direct communication from Deity, will be readily admitted. But the latter text has been wonderfully verified, in the almost infinite variety of "thoughts" which have been made known, concerning the character of Jesus. The subject appears to have been exhausted. At least, it is difficult to conceive what new idea could be revealed, unless some young Samson should come forth, with gigantic powers of invention.

2. The word revelation is employed in the Scriptures, to signify the manifestation of various beings and things, without special reference to the agency, by which they are made known. Hence, "the Son of man,"—"the man of sin,"—"the righteousness of God,"—"the wrath of God,"—"the mystery of Godliness,"—"the mystery of iniquity,"—"the works that shall abide," and those "which shall be burned up," are all said to be "revealed." See Luke xvii. 30. 2 Thess. ii. 3. Rom. i. 17, 18. Rom. xvi. 25. 2 Thess. ii. 7. 1 Cor. iii. 13, 14.

3. Revelations imply some discoveries in spiritual or divine things, by the members of the primitive, christian churches. This may be seen by consulting 1 Cor. xiv. 26. "How is it, then, brethren? when ye come together, every

one hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done to edifying." And again, verses 29, 30. "Let the prophets (see ver. 3d) speak two or three, and let the other judge. If any thing be revealed to another, that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace." Here, it will be observed, the things which were revealed to certain individuals of the church, could not have been received by any super-natural impressions; because, had that been the case, these inspired persons would not have got into such confusion, in their meetings, as to interrupt each other in speaking, and render it necessary for Paul to write them, and give particular directions how they should proceed. The services of the meeting consisted of various parts; such as singing, instruction in an ordinary manner, making known some new discoveries; explanation of the unknown tongue, probably the Hebrew; and the interpretation of some ambiguous and difficult subject. We do not discover any consistency in considering all the members of the primitive church, as infallible teachers; but, even should that be granted, it would by no means follow, that any are now taught in the same manner. Who can describe the mischief and folly, which have resulted from an erroneous construction of the term, "revelation," in the above text? It has been pressed into the service of the most ignorant and fanatical sectarians, and been urged in justification of those, who obtrude their weak and sickening tales of experiences, visions and dreams, upon religious assemblies, as things immediately revealed by the Holy Ghost. Nor would we so far digress, as to mention this fact, were such miserable pretensions confined to the conferences and class meetings. They are heard in "high places." Those who enter the sacred desk, frequently declare, that they depend wholly on what the Holy Spirit may suggest to them, as to matter and manner of discourse; and ask their hearers to pray that something may be given to them, which may save some poor souls from the wrath of God. By such means, they excite such fear and reverence in the younger, weaker, and more superstitious part of their congregations, that they will listen with tearful and heart-thrilling attention, to what would otherwise have excited universal disgust.—Yes; let a man of grave and solemn appearance be dressed in black, and when he rises before his audience, meekly confess his entire inability to perform the services of the meeting, unless God should deign to grant him super-natural assistance, and put something into his mouth specially adapted to that occasion, and he will be heard by a majority of the people, as though "the gods had come down, in the likeness of men." He may preach one of his old, jaded-out sermons, interspersed with anecdotes, which are perfectly familiar to most of them, and yet it will be hailed as a direct communication from the fountain of all wisdom and truth. Such is the force of superstition!

3. We shall briefly notice a few of the many examples, in which revelation implies, a special communication from God, according to our views of the subject.

The first is, Dan. ii. 19—23, which the reader can examine.—Since Nebuchadnezzar had not divulged his "dream" to any one, and had forgotten it himself, we are unable to conceive how it could have been revealed to him, by Daniel, excepting by an extraordinary interposition of Deity. And as there was no mutual intercourse between him and the king, it is not supposable that any thing but the very dream itself being brought fresh to his recollection, would have been acceptable. Daniel made known to the king, what the God of Israel had made known to him. But we shall not attempt to describe the process, by which Jehovah infuses knowledge, in these extraordinary cases; for we do not pretend to understand how any thing exists, which is produced by the Almighty. Who will volunteer his services to inform us how or in what manner, Deity performs any work or produces any effects, which are ascrib-

ble to his special agency? The operations of his power are infinitely various. To us, one part of God's work, is precisely as mysterious as another! Infidelity may laugh at our belief or faith, in what we cannot fully comprehend, as to the mode and manner of its existence; but we reply, in the language of Lord Bacon, that we "would sooner believe in all the fables of the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this Universal Frame is without a Mind." And since we cannot define the manner in which intellect and matter are united, constituting a rational being, it would be presumption to attempt an explanation of the process, by which the mind is extraordinarily enlightened, and informed. But we see no propriety in supposing that any violation is done to the laws of nature, in the production of what we denominate, *miraculous* effects.

The second passage which occurs to our mind, is, Matt. xi. 25. "At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes."

But even here, God is represented as *hiding* the same facts, from "the wise and prudent" men, and *revealing* them "to babes." Will any one maintain that the revelation, here mentioned, was any thing more, than making known, or exposing to mental view, what had been hidden? The 28th verse speaks a similar sentiment. The Father made himself known to the Son; but by what means, we know not; but the Son revealed his Father's character, by means of religious instruction. He taught the people, what he himself had learned of God.

But, lastly, the question appears to be settled by St. Paul, that a special and infallible manifestation of the gospel of Christ, was made to him, which no human power could have accomplished. "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."—Gal. i. 11, 12.

By consulting Acts xxvi. 16, and 1 Cor. ix. 1, &c. it will be demonstrable, that, however singular it may appear to us, St. Paul was taught his gospel, by the risen Saviour, and was authorized to instruct others by his ministry and writings, as an infallible witness of the truth.

The subject will be concluded in our next.

NOTE.—The Editor tenders his respectful acknowledgments to the "Editor and Publisher of the Maine Baptist Herald," for the promptness with which they inserted his correction, concerning *Owenism*, and if occasion require, he would be happy to imitate so laudable an example.

MARRIED,

In Turner, on the 1st inst. by Rev. GEORGE BATES, of Livermore, the Rev. ZENAS THOMPSON with the amiable Miss LEONORA LEAVITT, daughter of Major Isaac Leavitt, of Turner, (Me.)

DIED,

In this town, Mr. Ansel Lewis, aged 53 years.—Cornelia, youngest daughter of Capt. S. Sweetser, aged 15 months.—Charles Asa, son of Mr. Asa Jordan, aged 19 months.—Charles Augustus, youngest son of Mr. John B. Scott, aged 20 months.

In Belfast, on the 23th ult. widow LYDIA ELLIS, an industrious, worthy christian, formerly of Hanover, (Mass.) aged 61 years, 8 months and 15 days.

In New Gloucester, on the 20th ult. Mrs. DEBORAH, wife of Mr. JOHN WEBBER, after a long and severe sickness, which she bore with christian patience, aged 37.

Near Baltimore, Capt. Robert Trail Spence, a distinguished officer of the U. S. Navy.

POETRY.

EPITAPH.

The following beautiful lines, from the pen of Mr. T. Moore, are inscribed on a Tombstone in the Churchyard of Cheadle, in Staffordshire, to the memory of his friend, Joseph Atkinson, Esq. of Melfield, in the county of Dublin, who died whilst on a visit in that vicinity, a few years ago.—*Rockingham Gaz.*

If ever lot was prosperously cast,
If ever life was like the lengthened flow
Of some sweet music—sweetened to the last—
'Twas his, who, mourn'd by many, sleeps below.

The sunny temper, bright where all is strife,
The simple heart that mocks at worldly wiles;
Light wit that plays along the calm of life,
And stirs its languid surface into smiles—

Pure charity, that comes not in a shower,
Sudden and loud, oppressing what it feeds;
But like the dew, with gradual silent power,
Felt in the bloom it leaves among the meads—

The happy grateful spirit, that improves
And brightens every gift by fortune given;
That wanders where it will with those it loves,
Makes every place a home, and home a heaven—

All these were his—Oh! thou who read'st this stone,
When for thyself—thy children—to the sky
Thou humble prayest—ask this boon alone,
That ye like him may live—like him may die.

[For the Christian Intelligencer.]

Of Anecdotes in Religious Papers.

MR. EDITOR—On receiving the enclosed One Dollar, you are requested to forward to me the "Christian Intelligencer," Volume Six. I have read several numbers of late, and feel it my duty to encourage the work, on account of the impartiality and independence with which it is conducted. It is true, I do not profess to be of your persuasion, and my good wife is of the "Christian Order;" but we are both pleased with your paper. She has read your Anecdote ["Short Story"] of the Telescope, till it is perfectly committed to memory. It was the more pleasing to her, on account of her recollecting to have heard it related, about twelve or fourteen years ago, by Elder John Rand, of Woodstock, Vi. in an Ordination Sermon, at a Quarterly Meeting. Elder Rand was the first "Christian Preacher," that she ever heard; and her conversion took place in consequence of that very Sermon. She found, on examination, that when she looked for other people's sins, she had magnified them into mountains; but, when she searched for her own sins, her partial heart had turned the gospel glass, end for end, and her sins appeared much less, than they really were. By this means she was struck under conviction, and soon "turned unto the Lord," and found peace to her soul.—Finally, it is my opinion that if people would read such Anecdotes, in the same serious manner that our Ministers tell them, in their preaching, they would produce more pungent conviction, than any other human means. Elder Plummer, when he was in this

quarter, used to be a great hand at relating Anecdotes in his Sermons; and I have known from ten to twenty old sinners and hypocrites to "be pricked in the heart," at one meeting, and come forward immediately, and "confess their sins before all the people." Brother, though of a different faith, I wish you God-speed, so long as you are faithful, and expose iniquity, wherever it is found. You may do as you please with this, after fitting it for the press. Your obedient servant, A. F.

S*****, Oct. 6, 1826.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER.

Respected Brother—I have just arrived here, from Turner, for the purpose of preaching in this village to-morrow. It is a source of much satisfaction to me, to be informed of your renewed exertions, to spread far and wide, the unbounded glories of "the everlasting gospel," by publishing, every week, the Christian Intelligencer,—that fearless advocate for the triumphs of the Son of God.

I am highly pleased with the alteration you are about to make, and am not at all "surprised," when I consider you are ever striving to promote the principles of pure and undefiled religion. I can, sir, with sincerity and unspeakable pleasure, recommend to our brethren and all inquirers for truth, to patronise your work, under its new direction. The people, I believe, in general, in every section of the State, in which I have travelled, who have heretofore taken your paper, will be highly pleased. Many of them, in the circle of my acquaintance, have taken such a deep and lively interest and satisfaction, in perusing your columns, that they have expressed great impatience, in waiting for the arrival of the mail; and I have frequently heard them express a desire, that the paper might be published once a week. In short, I cannot find words, fully to express my approbation of the plan upon which the INTELLIGENCER is conducted.

May the blessing of our common Father rest upon your pious exertions, and crown your labors with abundant success. With sentiments of unmingled respect and affection, I am—

Yours, &c. ZENAS THOMPSON.

Norway, Oct. 7, 1826.

FOR SALE,

AT THE ARGUS OFFICE, AND BY THE EDITOR,
BALFOUR'S SECOND INQUIRY.

Persons who have subscribed for the 2nd Inquiry are requested to call for them at the Editor's house.

THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER

Is published every other Saturday, at ONE DOLLAR per annum, in advance. Persons who forward to the Editor five dollars, for new subscribers, shall be entitled to one Volume gratis.

RUSSELL STREETER, Editor and Proprietor.